

Page 12 Application No. 10/526,542

REMARKS

Mr Clayes, my patent advisor, has made a mistake in the description of my invention. (I went to him, rather than doing the job myself, and I gave him my full confidence, because he works as an engineer at GEVERS, a company recognised as specialists in this type of work.)

He considers that Mr Baker's system is the same as mine, with the exception of the attachment method, i.e. fixed to the bicycle at two points rather than the single point in my case. Beyond that, and rather bizarrely, he barely mentions my universal fixing system and the system for setting a universal arm which is designed differently from any other known system. A real novelty!

Indeed, the differences are enormous; for example, in Mr Baker's case part (16), which has two points of attachment to the bicycle rather than a single universal one, does not have the locating holes (17)!

My analogous part (5) does have them, while Mr Baker's part (14) does not play the part of my part (2). In other words part (14) is not designed to open so that parts can be set relative to one another as do my parts (5) and (2), which only serve for final adjustment or tightening. Mr Baker's part (14) remains mobile, as do the pivot pin housed in part (16) and that housed in part (10). Here Mr Baker has effectively created a double pivot represented by a round tube generally taking the form of a rectangular parallelepiped fitted into the housing of part (10) and the housing of part (16).

The double pivot (14) remains free, and part (10) can rotate towards the rear of the bicycle (see figure 3) and slides slightly between the rectangular parallelepiped double pivot represented by (14), before coming up against (28). My system is quite different, as my part (5) (contrary to what my patent agent stupidly said) does not involve a pivot, but rather two setting screws to be slackened off before setting parts (2) and (5) as desired relative to one another as required for a given assembly. After that these two interconnected pieces (2) and (5) effectively form a single piece. Part (5) thus does not include the pivot pin, unlike Mr Baker's part (16).

Again in contrast to Mr Baker, my part (2) does not represent a double pivot like Mr Baker's part (14); my part (2) is actually an independent part with quite specific roles which differ from those of Mr Baker's part (14).

Firstly, part (2) of my system forms a universal arm with part (5).

Secondly, part (2) also serves as an extension making it possible to put the drive system in contact with a bicycle wheel located a long way from the mounting point, e.g. on a traditional Dutch bicycle.

Thirdly, this part (2) has multiple mounting points (12) allowing the mounting point to be selected optimally. Mounting either the single pivot or a mounting for my device patented as EP1593593; in the case that my device EP1593593 is fitted, there is no longer any pivot point on my universal arm.

This is thus a new object, truly inventive and novel.

Page 13 Application No. 10/526,542

Remarks concerning the "Mr Baker" patent (EP0155185)

Despite what you might think, my invention has more than one difference from that of Mr Baker. Firstly there is also the setting system which you mention as a detail. (A system which is not limited to a single setting on a single part, but allows many others, detailed here; part (7) can be adjusted to any handlebar diameter using different collars. Furthermore, this part (7) be attached to any tube of the bicycle, perpendicular to the road or parallel to the road. The adjustment systems include the connection between parts (2) and (5), and are many in number allowing positioning with an almost infinite precision. Setting options also extend to part (2), noting the holes (12) arranged like a ladder which also allow a choice of multiple mounting points for pivot (4) or for my patent EP1593593). This part (2) can be exchanged for a similar part with a longer scale having precisely the same function, but which allows the universal arm to be extended if the assembly with the original part is too short for an adequately precise mounting.

As you will observe, we have a single, adjustable point of attachment, unlike Mr Baker, who allows for at least two. Additionally, Mr Baker's attachment system is not technically clearly explained.

Conversely, my single mounting point is explained, drawn, and can thus be created in the workshop. Unlike Mr Baker, whose attachments have incomplete plans or even no plans at all, and thus not realistically practicable in the workshop, if we are to base ourselves on Mr Baker's plans alone.

Mr Baker's part (14), which is shown in a diagram without perspective, must I imagine, be both a double pivot and a chassis, formed by a round tube in the form of a rectangular parallelepiped. (Or a single part forming two pivots and a chassis with limited use.) Additionally Mr Baker's part 14 remains mobile, and is a double pivot of which the first housing of the first pivot is located in the housing of part (16) and other pivot in the housing of the motor chassis (10).

Conversely, my system has clearly distinguished parts with very specific roles allocated to each. The result is that the assembly forms a true universal arm. Unlike Mr Baker's system, for example: my part (5) is equipped with a single point (7) for mounting on the bicycle, and also with holes allowing adjustment and fixing between (2) and (5).

The design of part (5) allows, by adding in my part (2) which has various holes, so that setting and locking screws allow the two pieces (2) and (5) to be joined together to form a specific assembly for each mounting, thus allowing my universal arm to take multiple forms as desired.

Part (2), as well as being an integral part of a true universal arm with these mechanical characteristics also, unlike Mr Baker's design, includes many holes (12) which enable pivot (4) or the apparatus from patent EP1593593 to be attached in various positions.

Part (2) also constitutes an extension to part (5); Mr Baker's system does not feature anything of the sort and is thus completely different.

Remarks concerning the "Mr Depoilly" patent (FR 2,346,178)

As regards Mr Depoilly's patent, FR 2346178A, this system does not have the same use or the same function.

Page 15 Application No. 10/526,542

And to give it a new purpose, in my case, for figure 7, to open or close a universal arm to attach a motor to a bicycle. (And not to adjust handlebars)

It seems to me a little as though all new inventions which include, for example, a ball bearing or a wheel or springs, or a resistance, etc., can no longer be the subject of a new patent, since that element would already be known. There is also the fact that Mr Weidner's system is designed to adjust bicycle handlebars, and is not a universal arm to attach any handlebars to any bicycle. It therefore seems to me that the mere resemblance of the setting system is not an adequate reason for preventing me from using the same adjustment principle for my universal arm.. I can also fit my universal arm to vehicles other than bicycles and indeed, to bicycles which were not invented by Mr Weidner. Everyone has something to contribute. (although I risk repeating myself, there have been a multitude of similar adjustments on a whole range of other devices over the years)

Remarks concerning the "Mr Sinclair" patent (USPN 6, 497, 299)

Firstly, it can be seen that the Sinclair device is to be mounted on a bicycle using **three mounting points**, while mine requires only **one** whilst demonstrating considerable flexibility in usage. While the Sinclair system is attached both to the frame (one mounting point) and the handlebars (two mounting points) while permitting only one form of motor, mine can be attached to any form of light vehicle and allows the attachment of various forms of motor (petrol engine, electric motor, etc.) while using only a **single mounting** which, in the case of a bicycle, could be located either at the **base of the handlebars** or at the **base of the saddle**.

The originality of my invention does not lie merely in this observation since a careful examination of my device will highlight the universal nature of an **articulated arm** with myriad possibilities for adaptation to a drive system, which is the essence of my patent.

Remarks concerning the "Mr Muller" patent (CH 685,757)

This consists of an adjustable luggage rack and no more. It cannot be motorised in any event. Its single mounting point is no more original than that for a front light or any other accessory and the kinematics of the system serve only as a pale caricature (no slight intended, since we are dealing with items which are not comparable) of my system with its vast number of possibilities for adjustment and for adaptation to motors for various light vehicles.

I hope that these explanations will help you distinguish between the various inventions, each of which have different functions and objectives.

Please find enclosed:

-the drawings of my patent EP 1593593,

- a photo showing the universal arm currently fitted, for patent EP1593593; you may observe

although that the offices which correspond to part (6) of 6-6-06

PAGE 17/17 * RCVD AT 1/22/2007 8:30:45 AM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/6 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:003243459901 * DURATION (mm-ss):08-00E

BEST AVAILABLE COPY